



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,649	03/31/2004	Ravi Prakash Srivastava	4062-116	4934

23117 7590 02/17/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

HAJNIK, DANIEL F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/813,649	Applicant(s) SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
	Examiner Daniel F. Hajnik	Art Unit 2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Throughout the specification, parts of the figures are referred to by color, i.e. "FIG. 1(a) and (b) represents the fundamental of existing Voronoi tessellation where in circles are drawn (shown in blue color) with increasing radius about the Voronoi centers (shown in red color) and a tangent line (shown in green color)" (top of pg. 5). Please replace these color references with label numbers because the figures are published in black and white.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The references listed on pages 10 and 11 maybe related prior art. It is recommended that such prior art be cited in an Information Disclosure Statement. Not all of the documents cited are readily accessible to the examiner (see 37 CFR 1.56).

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: All symbols used in any equations should be defined in the claim, i.e. variables p , q , r , f , and m are not explained as to their meaning in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2671

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "such as density in lateral and vertical directions" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ledru et al. (NPL Document "GeoFrance3D: an integrated approach to 3D geological and geophysical imaging of the subsurface", herein referred to as "Ledru") in view of Shirriff (NPL Document "Generating Fractals from Voronoi Diagrams", herein referred to as "Shirriff") in further view of Sides (NPL Document "Geological modelling of mineral deposits for prediction in mining", herein referred to as "Sides").

As per claim 1, Ledru teaches the claimed "selecting Voronoi centers at a plurality of locations over a region of interest" by teaching of "a 3D solid model of all the geological formations can be constructed automatically using Voronoi diagrams.

Starting from a generated set of points issued from the data, this method computes a

Art Unit: 2671

partition of space according to the nearest neighbour. The constructed solids are topologically closed and share common boundaries" (paragraph right above figure 5) where the set of points may be one or more voronoi centers over a region of interest. Further, data points for a 3D model would most likely use X, Y, and Z coordinates.

Ledru teaches the claimed "assigning values of physical property variations during generation of the model" by teaching of "attributing densities to each geological unit" (paragraph right after figure 1) and by teaching of "The current approach is to combine geological and geophysical methods to create a '3D exchange system' that will test the modelled 3D imagery resulting from each method" (2nd paragraph in document).

Ledru teaches the claimed "assigning different colours to regions in the model" in figures 1, 3, 5 where the different shaded areas represent different colors of regions in the models shown.

Ledru does not explicitly teach the claimed "generating an initial model of the subsurface fractal geological object". Shirriff teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "To generate the fractal images, we start with a small set of points and draw the Voronoi diagram of these points" (2nd paragraph in body of the text).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Ledru and Shirriff. One advantage to the combination is provided by Shirriff, which teaches of "Voronoi diagrams can be used to generate interesting fractal patterns" (1st paragraph in body of text).

Ledru does not explicitly teach the claimed "the initial model being generated by tessellating". Sides teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "A polygonal tessellation based on connecting the circumcentres of Delaunay triangles, termed a Voronoi tessellation" (1st full paragraph in 1st col on pg. 346) and by teaching of "3D model building" (2nd full paragraph in 1st col on pg. 346).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sides with the combinable system of Ledru and Shirriff. One advantage to the combination is provided by Sides, which teaches of "By weighting the thickness, or other property values, at each vertex according to the area of the corresponding polygon, estimates of volumes and tonnages can be made" (1st full paragraph in 1st col on pg. 346) and by teaching of "Accurate prediction of the shape, location, size and properties of the solid rock materials to be extracted during mining is essential for reliable technical and financial planning" (abstract).

As per claim 6, Ledru teaches the claimed "geophysical inversion, wherein the tessellated regions are altered by changing the position of Voronoi centers in each iteration" by teaching of "(iii) a modification of the preliminary geological sections on the basis of direct inversion of the gravity data. The dependability of the model was tested by calculating the geophysical response after attributing densities to each geological unit" (paragraph right below figure 1) and by teaching of "a 3D solid model ... using Voronoi diagrams ... the proposed solution allows interpretation-construction reiteration until the model is deemed satisfactory" (paragraph right above figure 5).

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ledru in view of Shirriff in further view of Sides in further view of Mishev (NPL Document "Finite Volume Methods on Voronoi Meshes", herein referred to as "Mishev").

As per claim 2, Ledru does not explicitly teach the claimed "the fractal subsurface model is generated by modified Voronoi tessellation technique which comprises modifying the Voronoi tessellation by using L^p norm". Mishev teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "Voronoi meshes" (1st paragraph under section VI) and by teaching of "Results reported for problems 3 and 4 show first-order in the L^2 norm" (1st paragraph under section titled 'Problem 4') where in this case $p = 2$.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Mishev with the combinable system of Ledru, Shirriff, and Sides. One advantage to the combination is provided by Mishev, which teaches of applying the L^2 norm effectively to a large number of mesh points (see figure 4 and first paragraph in section VI).

9. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ledru in view of Shirriff in further view of Sides in further view of Archibald et al. (NPL Document "Multiscale edge analysis of potential field data", herein referred to as "Archibald").

As per claim 3, Ledru does not explicitly teach the claimed "natural setting of the geological subsurface is selected from the group consisting of a sedimentary basin,

Art Unit: 2671

hydrocarbon deposits, oil reservoirs, aquifers and mineral deposits". Archibald teaches the claimed limitation by teaching of "a function of the subsurface 3D location of contacts between bodies of contrasting density" (3rd paragraph in Introduction), by teaching of "geological mapping purposes such as to map subtle changes in sedimentary sequences" (4th paragraph under Abstract), and by teaching of "Three real datasets at different geographical scales have been analysed ... dataset from a mineralised greenstone terrane in Western Australia" (4th paragraph under Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Archibald with the combinable system of Ledru, Shirriff, and Sides. One advantage to the combination is provided by Archibald, which teaches of "The techniques described below aim to improve the current practices of analysis and 3D geological inversion of potential field data. This is achieved by extracting and visualising in 3D the main features in a potential field map ... these features have a rigorous relationship to subsurface contacts between zones of different density or magnetic susceptibility, and can thus be employed in an inversion strategy" (1st paragraph under the Introduction).

As per claim 5, Ledru does not explicitly teach the claimed "the results are achieved through self-written software, which generates Voronoi tessellated subsurface region and computes gravity response of the same". However, Ledru suggests this limitation of "self-written software" by teaching of "automatically using Voronoi diagrams ... Since the construction of the solid is automatic" (paragraph right above figure 5).

Art Unit: 2671

One advantage to self-written software may be to save the operator's time and energy by using reliable tessellation and gravity response algorithms to perform the work successfully instead of having the operator perform it.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel F. Hajnik whose telephone number is (571) 272-7642. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30A-5:00P).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka J. Chauhan can be reached on (571) 272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2671

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Klein

2/8/06

DFH

Ulka Chauhan

ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER